

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900  
Prathima Price, Esq., SBN 321378  
Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082  
Christopher A. Seabock, Esq., SBN 279640  
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92111  
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
ChrisS@potterhandy.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**Scott Johnson,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**Desai Hospitality Group, LLC,** a  
California Limited Liability  
Company; and Does 1-10,

Defendants.

**Case No. 4:20-cv-05404-KAW**

**First Amended Complaint For  
Damages And Injunctive Relief  
For Violations Of:** Americans  
With Disabilities Act; Unruh Civil  
Rights Act

Plaintiff Scott Johnson complains of Desai Hospitality Group, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; and Does 1-10 ("Defendants"), and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES:**

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. Plaintiff is a level C-5 quadriplegic. He cannot walk and also has significant manual dexterity impairments. He uses a wheelchair for mobility and has a specially equipped van.

2. Defendant Desai Hospitality Group, LLC owned the real property located at or about 373 S. Airport Blvd., South San Francisco, California,

1 between November 2019 and March 2020.

2 3. Defendant Desai Hospitality Group, LLC owns the real property located  
3 at or about 373 S. Airport Blvd., South San Francisco, California, currently.

4 4. Defendant Desai Hospitality Group, LLC owned Holiday Inn Express  
5 located at or about 373 S. Airport Blvd., South San Francisco, California,  
6 between November 2019 and March 2020.

7 5. Defendant Desai Hospitality Group, LLC owns Holiday Inn Express  
8 (“Motel”) located at or about 373 S. Airport Blvd., South San Francisco,  
9 California, currently.

10 6. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business  
11 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their  
12 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,  
13 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.  
14 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein,  
15 including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the  
16 events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief.  
17 Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities,  
18 connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10,  
19 inclusive, are ascertained.

20  
21 **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

22 7. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to  
23 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans  
24 with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

25 8. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause  
26 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of  
27 the same transactions, is also brought under California’s Unruh Civil Rights  
28 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

1       9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is  
2 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is  
3 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.  
4

5       **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

6       10. Plaintiff went to the Motel in November 2019, January 2020 (twice),  
7 February 2020 and March 2020 with the intention to avail himself of its  
8 services motivated in part to determine if the defendants comply with the  
9 disability access laws.

10       11. The Motel is a facility open to the public, a place of public  
11 accommodation, and a business establishment.

12       12. Unfortunately, on the dates of the plaintiff's visits, the defendants failed  
13 to provide wheelchair accessible parking in conformance with the ADA  
14 Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

15       13. On information and belief the defendants currently fail to provide  
16 wheelchair accessible parking.

17       14. These barriers relate to and impact the plaintiff's disability. Plaintiff  
18 personally encountered these barriers.

19       15. As a wheelchair user, the plaintiff benefits from and is entitled to use  
20 wheelchair accessible facilities. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the  
21 defendants denied the plaintiff full and equal access.

22       16. The failure to provide accessible facilities created difficulty and  
23 discomfort for the Plaintiff.

24       17. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable  
25 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with  
26 disabilities.

27       18. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much  
28 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the

1 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,  
2 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous  
3 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of  
4 access if complete removal were not achievable.

5 19. Plaintiff will return to the Motel to avail himself of its services and to  
6 determine compliance with the disability access laws once it is represented to  
7 him that the Motel and its facilities are accessible. Plaintiff is currently  
8 deterred from doing so because of his knowledge of the existing barriers and  
9 his uncertainty about the existence of yet other barriers on the site. If the  
10 barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and discriminatory  
11 barriers again.

12 20. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations  
13 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are  
14 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will  
15 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this  
16 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that  
17 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See  
18 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff  
19 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his  
20 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

**I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

21. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

22. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADA Standards.
- c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

23. When a business provides parking for its customers, it must provide accessible parking.

24. Here, accessible parking has not been provided in conformance with the ADA Standards.

25. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the 1991 Standards.

26. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

27. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

**II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51-53.)

28. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia, that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal. Civ. Code §51(b).

29. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

30. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff’s rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,

1 privileges, or services offered.

2 31. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,  
3 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each  
4 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-  
5 (c).)

6 32. Although the plaintiff encountered frustration and difficulty by facing  
7 discriminatory barriers, even manifesting itself with minor and fleeting  
8 physical symptoms, the plaintiff does not value this very modest physical  
9 personal injury greater than the amount of the statutory damages.

10  
11 **PRAYER:**

12 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide  
13 relief as follows:

14 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the  
15 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the  
16 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not  
17 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

18 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual  
19 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

20 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant  
21 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code § 52.

22  
23 Dated: October 5, 2020

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

24  
25 By: /s/ Christopher A. Seabock

26 Christopher A. Seabock  
27 Attorney for Plaintiff  
28